

Docket No. 1083.1048/MS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Hasebe et al

Group Art Unit: 2165

Serial No.: 09/000,924

Examiner: NGUYEN, C

Filed: December 30, 1997

For: DATA PROTECTION SYSTEM, DATA PREPARATION DEVICE, AND DATA WORKING DEVICE

FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW ONLY
DISTINCTIONS OF THE PRESENT INVENTION OVER THE PRIOR ART

In the Office Action mailed August 3, 2000 the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9, 12, 15, 18-22 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Hasebe et al. (US Patent No. 5,392,351 - Hasebe #1) in view of Hasebe et al. (US Patent No. 5,761,651 - Hasebe #2) and further in view of Iwayama (US Patent No. 5,832,083); claim 6 for the same rationale as claim 4; claim 7 for the same rationale as claim 1; claims 10-11 as being obvious over Iwayama; claim 13 and 16 for the same rationale as claim 1; claim 14 for the same rationale as claim 1; and claim 17 for the same rationale as claim 14.

DISTINCTIONS OF THE PRESENT INVENTION OVER THE PRIOR ART

In item 11 (Remarks) on page 9, lines 1-9 of the Office Action mailed August 3, 2000, the Examiner suggests that the term "embedding" can imply complete integration, such that "input data" and "data", which may include "embedded data" are not distinguishable (i.e., data, including any embedded data, should be treated as the whole data). Therefore, the Examiner may not have given weight to the distinguishing features of the present invention as recited in claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 15 and 18-22 as pending for the Office Action mailed August 3, 2000.

In contrast to the references relied upon, the present invention uses an approach for creating compound documents (i.e., "linking" or "embedding" of data objects in another data object, another data object being, for example, a document) for preventing use of data without

In. Summary

diff. meaning
w/ applicantsnotoriously
well-known

diff. meanings